

March 26, 1975

SENATOR ANDERSON: Yeah, I'd just like to comment on the amendment. I had no objection to the amendment. I think that what this does it changes the funding system for the program. The way the amendments are written there is a \$30 fee that they have to pay for these special permits. The idea behind the \$30 fee is to make sure that enough money is charged that that pays for the administration of the program. Whether we do it this way, or whether we do it by putting the money in the general fund and then re-appropriating it going through the appropriation process, I assume this would then necessitate an A bill. This really makes no difference to me. I think we should understand, in considering the amendments, that however we handle this thing enough money is being charged for the fee to pay for the program, so there would be no additional cost to the taxpayers.

PRESIDENT: Senator Syas do you wish to speak on the narrow Warner amendment?

SENATOR SYAS: Yes.

PRESIDENT: Senator Syas.

SENATOR SYAS: Well just to comment that I'm curious about . . . and I'm going to ask Senator Marvel what the way out is. I'm not opposing, nor for or against, the amendment as such. It seems to me yesterday that we had a bill on Final Reading where we did just the opposite. We earmarked the funds on some bills, I remember. I don't remember the number of it. Now today we're not earmarking. I don't know, I think we're going to have to make up our minds in the Legislature which side of the horse we're going to get on. I'd like to have Senator Marvel comment, because he's kind of my leader on this.

SENATOR MARVEL: I'm glad to hear that, Senator Syas. As I understood the Warner motion it took the fees that were collected, put them in the general fund, they are then appropriated back out of the general fund for this specific purpose. Is that it Senator Warner? OK. Senator Syas, we are talking about the issue . . . this is going to come up several times during this session. I know you are sincere when some of you want to create cash funds. I warn you that unless those cash funds are very carefully administered, you are giving away appropriation authority. When you set up cash funds, that money should go into the general fund, the Department should justify the expenditure even if it's cash. They should come before the appropriate committee to justify the use of this money. We're not talking about earmarking appropriations, Senator Syas. We're talking about earmarking revenue at the moment. There is a very definite difference. If we do not take these cash funds and put them in the general fund and appropriate them back, I'll tell you what's going to happen, the Department, whether we're talking about the Ag Department which is a flagrant violator in this area. We could talk about others. You have all kinds of bills that are proposed by the Ag Department to set up cash funds. They don't intend to justify the use of that money. You're going to get in the same problem that you're in with the Wheat Commission, where they feel that this is their money, they can do what they want to with it. This is not their money. This money is only authorized by law. This money, therefore, should go into the general fund and be appropriated